THE LEAST COMMON MULTIPLE OF A QUADRATIC SEQUENCE

JAVIER CILLERUELO

Abstract. For any irreducible quadratic polynomial $f(x)$ in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ we obtain the estimate $\log$ l.c.m. $\{f(1),\ldots,f(n)\} = n\log n + Bn + o(n)$ where B is a constant depending on f.

1. Introduction

It is well known that $\log \text{l.c.m.}\{1,\ldots,n\} \sim n$. Indeed, this asymptotic estimate is equivalent to the prime number theorem. The analogous for arithmetic progressions is also known [1] and it is a consequence of the prime number theorem for arithmetic progressions:

$$\log \text{l.c.m.}\{a+b,\ldots,an+b\} \sim n\frac{q}{\phi(q)}\sum_{\substack{1\le k\le q\\(k,q)=1}}\frac{1}{k}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $q = a/(a,b)$.

We address here the problem of estimating $\log \text{l.c.m.}\{f(1),\ldots,f(n)\}$ when f is an irreducible quadratic polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$. The same problem for reducible quadratic polynomials is easier and we study it in section §4.

Theorem 1.1. *For any irreducible quadratic polynomial $f(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$ in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ we have*

$$\log \textit{l.c.m.}\ \{f(1),\ldots,f(n)\} = n\log n + Bn + o(n)$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 11N37.

Key words and phrases. least common multiple, quadratic sequences, equidistribution of roots of quadratic congruences.

This work was supported by Grant MTM 2008-03880 of MYCIT (Spain).

where $B = B_f$ is defined by the formula

$$B_f = \gamma - 1 - 2\log 2 - \sum_p \frac{(d/p)\log p}{p-1} + \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\substack{1\le r\le q\\(r,q)=1}} \log\Big(1+\frac{r}{q}\Big) + \log a + \sum_{p\mid 2aD} \log p\Big(\frac{1+(d/p)}{p-1} - \sum_{k\ge 1}\frac{s(f,p^k)}{p^k}\Big). \tag{1.2}$$

In this formula γ is the Euler constant, $D = b^2-4ac$, d is the fundamental discriminant, (d/p) is the Kronecker symbol, $q = a/(a,b)$ and $s(f,p^k)$ is the number of solutions of $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^k}$, which can be calculated easily using lemma 2.2.

In section §3 we give an alternative expression for the constant B_f, which is more convenient for numerical computations. As an example we will see that for the simplest case, $f(x) = x^2+1$, the constant B_f in theorem 1.1 can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} B_f &= \gamma - 1 - \frac{\log 2}{2} - \sum_p \frac{(-4/p)\log p}{p-1} \\ &= \gamma - 1 - \frac{\log 2}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{\zeta'(2^k)}{\zeta(2^k)} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{L'(2^k,\chi_{-4})}{L(2^k,\chi_{-4})} - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{\log 2}{2^{2^k}-1} \\ &= -0.066275634213060706383563177025... \end{aligned}$$

It would be interesting to extend our estimates to irreducible polynomials of higher degree, but we have found a serious obstruction in our argument. Some heuristic arguments and computations allow us to conjecture that the asymptotic estimate

$$\log \text{l.c.m. } \{f(1),\dots,f(n)\} \sim (\deg(f)-1)n\log n$$

holds for any irreducible polynomial f in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ of degree ≥ 2.

An important ingredient in the proof of theorem 1.1 is a deep result about the distribution of the solutions of the quadratic congruences $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod p$ when p runs over all the primes. It was proved by Duke, Friedlander and Iwaniec [2] (for $D<0$), and by Toth (for $D>0$). Actually we will need a more general statement of this result, due to Toth.

Theorem 1.2 (Toth [4])**.** *For any irreducible quadratic polynomial f in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$, the sequence*

$$\{\nu/p,\ 0\le \nu < p \le x,\ p\in S,\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p\}$$

is well distributed in $[0,1)$ as x tends to infinity for any arithmetic progression S containing infinitely many primes p for which the congruence $f(x)\equiv 0 \pmod p$ has solutions.

Acknowledgment. We thank to Arpad Toth for clarifying the statement of theorem 1.2 in [4], to Guoyou Qian for detecting a mistake in Lemma 2.2, to Adolfo Quirós for conversations on some algebraic aspects of the problem, to Enrique González Jiménez for the calculations of some constants and to Fernando Chamizo for some suggestions and a carefully reading of the paper.

2. Proof of theorem 1.1

2.1. **Preliminaries.** For $f(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$ we define $D = b^2 - 4ac$ and

$$L_n(f) = \text{l.c.m.}\{f(1), \dots, f(n)\}.$$

Since $L_n(f) = L_n(-f)$ we can assume that $a > 0$. Also we can assume that $f(x)$ is positive and increasing for $x \geq 1$. If it is not the case, we consider a polynomial $f_k(x) = f(k + x)$ for a k such that $f_k(x)$ is positive and increasing for $x \geq 1$. Then we observe that $L_n(f) = L_n(f_k) + O_k(\log n)$ and that the error term is negligible for the statement of theorem 1.1.

We define the numbers $\beta_p(n)$ by the formula

$$L_n(f) = \prod_p p^{\beta_p(n)} \tag{2.1}$$

where the product runs over all the primes p. The primes involved in this product are those for which the congruence $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod p$ has some solution. Except for some special primes (those such that $p \mid 2aD$) the congruence $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod p$ has 0 or 2 solutions. We will discus it in detail in lemma 2.2.

We denote by $\mathcal{P}_f$ the set of the non special primes for which the congruence $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod p$ has exactly two solutions. More concretely

$$\mathcal{P}_f = \{p : \ p \nmid 2aD, \ (D/p) = 1\}$$

where (D/p) is the Kronecker symbol. This symbol is just the Legendre symbol when p is an odd prime.

The quadratic reciprocity law shows that the set $\mathcal{P}_f$ is the set of the primes lying in exactly $\varphi(4D)/2$ of the $\varphi(4D)$ arithmetic progressions modulo $4D$, coprimes with $4D$. As a consequence of the prime number theorem for arithmetic progressions we have

$$\#\{p \leq x : \ p \in \mathcal{P}_f\} \sim \frac{x}{2 \log x}$$

or equivalently,

$$\sum_{\substack{0 \leq \nu < p \leq x \\ f(\nu) \equiv 0 \pmod p}} 1 \sim \frac{x}{\log x}.$$

Let $C = 2a + b$. We classify the primes involved in (2.1) in

- *Special* primes: those such that $p \mid 2aD$.
- $p \in \mathcal{P}_f$: $\begin{cases} \textit{Small} \text{ primes : } p < n^{2/3}. \\ \textit{Medium} \text{ primes: } n^{2/3} \le p < Cn \ : \begin{cases} \textit{bad} \text{ primes: } p^2 \mid f(i) \text{ for some } i \le n. \\ \textit{good} \text{ primes: } p^2 \nmid f(i) \text{ for any } i \le n. \end{cases} \\ \textit{Large} \text{ primes: } Cn \le p \le f(n). \end{cases}$

We will use different strategies to deal with these primes.

2.2. **Large primes.** To deal with the large primes we consider $P_n(f)$ and the numbers $\alpha_p(n)$ defined by the expression

$$P_n(f) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} f(i) = \prod_p p^{\alpha_p(n)}. \tag{2.2}$$

Next lemma allow us to avoid the large primes.

Lemma 2.1. *If $p \ge 2an + b$ then $\alpha_p(n) = \beta_p(n)$.*

Proof. If $\beta_p = 0$ then $\alpha_p(n) = 0$. If $\alpha_p(n) > \beta_p(n) \ge 1$ there exist $i < j \le n$ such that $p \mid f(i)$ and $p \mid f(j)$. It implies that $p \mid f(j) - f(i) = (j - i)(a(j + i) + b)$. Thus $p \mid (j - i)$ or $p \mid a(j + i) + b$, which is not possible because $p \ge 2an + b$. $\square$

Since $C = 2a + b$ we can write

$$\log L_n(f) = \log P_n(f) + \sum_{p<Cn} (\beta_p(n) - \alpha_p(n)) \log p. \tag{2.3}$$

Indeed we can take C to be any constant greater than $2a + b$. As we will see, the final estimate of $\log L_n(f)$ will not depend on C.

The estimate of $\log P_n(f)$ is easy:

$$\begin{aligned} \log P_n(f) &= \log \prod_{k=1}^{n} f(k) = \log \prod_{k=1}^{n} ak^2 \Big(1 + \frac{b}{ka} + \frac{c}{k^2 a}\Big) \\ &= n \log a + \log(n!)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \log\Big(1 + \frac{b}{ka} + \frac{c}{k^2 a}\Big) \\ &= 2n \log n + n(\log a - 2) + O(\log n) \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

and we obtain

$$\log L_n(f) = 2n \log n + n(\log a - 2) + \sum_{p<Cn} (\beta_p(n) - \alpha_p(n)) \log p + O(\log n). \tag{2.5}$$

2.3. **The number of solutions of $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^k}$ and the special primes.** The number of solutions of the congruence $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^k}$ will play an important role in the proof of theorem 1.1. We write $s(f, p^k)$ to denote this quantity.

Lemma below resumes all the casuistic for $s(f, p^k)$. We observe that except for a finite number of primes, those dividing $2aD$, we have that $s(f; p^k) = 2$ or 0 according with $(D/p) = 1$ or -1.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $f(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$ be an irreducible polynomial and $D = b^2 - 4ac$.*

(1) *If $p \nmid 2a$, $D = p^l D_p$ and $(D_p, p) = 1$ then*

$$s(f, p^k) = \begin{cases} p^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor}, & k \le l \\ 0, & k > l,\ l \text{ odd or } (D_p/p) = -1 \\ 2p^{l/2}, & k > l,\ l \text{ even } \ (D_p/p) = 1. \end{cases}$$

(2) *If $p \mid a$, $p \neq 2$ then* $s(f, p^k) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } p \mid b \\ 1, & \text{if } p \nmid b. \end{cases}$

(3) *If b is odd then, for all $k \ge 2$,* $s(f, 2^k) = s(f, 2) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } a \text{ is even} \\ 0 \text{ if } a \text{ is odd and } c \text{ is odd} \\ 2 \text{ if } a \text{ is odd and } c \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$

(4) *If b is even and a is even then $s(f, 2^k) = 0$ for any $k \ge 1$.*

(5) *If b is even and a is odd, let $D = 4^l D'$, $D' \not\equiv 0 \pmod 4$.*
   (a) *If $k \le 2l - 1$,* $\quad s(f; 2^k) = 2^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor}$
   (b) *If $k = 2l$,* $\quad s(f; 2^k) = \begin{cases} 2^l, & D' \equiv 1 \pmod 4 \\ 0, & D' \not\equiv 1 \pmod 4. \end{cases}$
   (c) *If $k \ge 2l + 1$,* $\quad s(f; 2^k) = \begin{cases} 2^{l+1}, & D' \equiv 1 \pmod 8 \\ 0, & D' \not\equiv 1 \pmod 8. \end{cases}$

Proof. The proof is a consequence of elementary manipulations and Hensel's lemma. □

Corollary 2.1. *If $p \nmid 2aD$ then $s(f, p^k) = 1 + (D/p)$.*

Proof. In this case, $l = 0$ and $D_p = D$ in lemma 2.2. Thus $s(f, p^k) = 0 = 1 + (D/p)$ if $(D/p) = -1$ and $s(f, p^k) = 2 = 1 + (D/p)$ if $(D/p) = 1$. □

Lemma 2.3.

$$\alpha_p(n) = n \sum_{k \ge 1} \frac{s(f, p^k)}{p^k} + O\left(\frac{\log n}{\log p}\right). \tag{2.6}$$

where $s(f;p^k)$ *denotes the number of solutions of* $f(x)\equiv 0 \pmod{p^k},\ 0\le x<p^k$.

Proof. We observe that the maximum exponent $\alpha_{p,i}$ such that $p^{\alpha_{p,i}} \mid f(i)$ can be written as $\alpha_{p,i}=\sum_{k\ge 1,\ p^k\mid f(i)} 1$. Thus

$$\alpha_p(n)=\sum_{i\le n}\alpha_{p,i}=\sum_{i\le n}\sum_{\substack{k\ge 1\\ p^k\mid f(i)}}1=\sum_{k\ge 1}\sum_{\substack{i\le n\\ p^k\mid f(i)}}1. \tag{2.7}$$

The trivial estimate $s(f;p^k)\left[\frac{n}{p^k}\right]\le\sum_{i\le n,\ p^k\mid f(i)}1\le s(f;p^k)\left(\left[\frac{n}{p^k}\right]+1\right)$ gives

$$\sum_{\substack{i\le n\\ p^k\mid f(i)}}1=n\frac{s(f;p^k)}{p^k}+O(s(f;p^k)). \tag{2.8}$$

Putting (2.8) in (2.7) and observing that $k\le\log f(n)/\log p$ and that $s(f,p^k)\ll 1$, we get

$$\alpha_p(n)=n\sum_{k\ge 1}\frac{s(f,p^k)}{p^k}+O\Big(\frac{\log n}{\log p}\Big).$$

□

We observe that $\beta_p(n)=\max_{i\le n}\alpha_{p,i}$, so

$$\beta_p(n)\ll\log n/\log p. \tag{2.9}$$

Now we put (2.9) and (2.6) in (2.5) for the special primes obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}\log L_n(f)=2n\log n+n\left(\log a-2-\sum_{p\mid 2aD}\sum_{k\ge 1}\frac{s(f,p^k)\log p}{p^k}\right)\\ +\sum_{p<Cn,\ p\nmid 2aD}(\beta_p(n)-\alpha_p(n))\log p+O(\log n).\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

2.4. **Small primes.** Lemma 2.3 has an easier formulation for small primes.

Lemma 2.4. *For any* $p\nmid 2aD$ *we have*

$$\alpha_p(n)=n\frac{1+(D/p)}{p-1}+O\Big(\frac{\log n}{\log p}\Big). \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. It is a consequence of lemma 2.3 and corollary 2.1. □

By substituting (2.11) and (2.9) in (2.10) we obtain

(2.12)
$$\log L_n(f) = 2n\log n + n\left(\log a - 2 - \sum_{p\mid 2aD}\sum_{k\geq 1}\frac{s(f,p^k)\log p}{p^k}\right)$$
$$- \sum_{\substack{p<n^{2/3}\\ p\nmid 2aD}}\frac{(1+(D/p))\log p}{p-1} + \sum_{\substack{n^{2/3}\leq p<Cn\\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}}(\beta_p(n)-\alpha_p(n))\log p + O(n^{2/3}).$$

2.5. **Medium primes.** Medium primes also can be classified in bad and good primes. Bad primes are those p such that $p^2 \mid f(i)$ for some $i \leq n$. Good primes are those are not bad primes.

As we have seen in the previous section, for any prime $p \in \mathcal{P}_f$ the congruence $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod p$ has exactly two solutions, say $0 \leq \nu_{p,1}, \nu_{p,2} < p$.

If p is a good prime we have that $\alpha_p(n)$ is just the number of integers $i \leq n$ such that $p \mid f(i)$. These integers are all of the form

$$\nu_{p,1} + kp, \quad 0 \leq k \leq \left[\frac{n-\nu_{p,1}}{p}\right] \tag{2.13}$$
$$\nu_{p,2} + kp, \quad 0 \leq k \leq \left[\frac{n-\nu_{p,2}}{p}\right]. \tag{2.14}$$

Also it is clear that if p is a good prime then $\beta_p(n) \leq 1$. These observations motive the following definition:

Definition 1. *For any $p \in \mathcal{P}_f$ we define*

$$\alpha_p^*(n) = \left[\frac{n-\nu_{p,1}}{p}\right] + \left[\frac{n-\nu_{p,2}}{p}\right] + 2 \tag{2.15}$$
$$\beta_p^*(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & \textit{if } \beta_p(n) \geq 1 \\ 0, & \textit{otherwise.}\end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

Lemma 2.5. *For any $p \in \mathcal{P}_f$ we have*

i) $\alpha_p(n) - \alpha_p^*(n) = \frac{2n}{p(p-1)} + O(\log n/\log p)$
ii) $\alpha_p(n) = \alpha_p^*(n)$ *and* $\beta_p(n) = \beta_p^*(n)$ *if* $p^2 \nmid f(i)$ *for any* $i \leq n$.

Proof. i) Lemma 2.4 implies that $\alpha_p(n) = \frac{2n}{p-1} + O(\log n/\log p)$ when $p \in \mathcal{P}_f$. On the other hand we have that $\alpha_p^*(n) = \frac{2n}{p} + O(1)$. Thus, $\alpha_p(n) - \alpha_p^*(n) = \frac{2n}{p-1} + O(\log n/\log p) - \frac{2n}{p} + O(1) = \frac{2n}{p(p-1)} + O(\log n/\log p)$.

ii) The first assertion has been explained at the beginning of the subsection. For the second, if $p \nmid f(i)$ for any $i \le n$ then $\beta_p(n) = \beta^*_p(n) = 0$. And if $p \mid f(i)$ for some $i \le n$ we have that $\beta^*_p(n) = \beta_p(n) = 1$ since $p^2 \nmid f(i)$. □

Now we split the last sum in (2.12) in

(2.17)
$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{n^{2/3}\le p<Cn\\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} (\beta_p(n)-\alpha_p(n))\log p &= \sum_{\substack{n^{2/3}\le p<Cn\\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} (\beta_p(n)-\beta^*_p(n)-\alpha_p(n)+\alpha^*_p(n))\log p\\ &+\sum_{\substack{p<Cn\\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \beta^*_p(n)\log p - \sum_{\substack{n^{2/3}\le p<Cn\\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \alpha^*_p(n)\log p + O(n^{2/3})\\ &= S_1(n)+S_2(n)-S_3(n)+O(n^{2/3}).\end{aligned}$$

To estimate $S_1(n)$ we observe that lemma 2.5 ii) implies that $\beta_p(n)-\beta^*_p(n)-\alpha_p(n)+\alpha^*_p(n) = 0$ for any good prime p. On the other hand, lemma 2.5 i) and (2.9) implies that $|\beta_p(n)-\beta^*_p(n)-\alpha_p(n)+\alpha^*_p(n)| \ll \log n/\log p$. Thus,

$$|S_1(n)| \ll \log n\ |\{p:\ n^{2/3}<p<Cn,\ p \text{ bad}\}|. \tag{2.18}$$

Lemma 2.6. *The number of bad primes $p \nmid D$, $Q \le p < 2Q$ is $\ll n^2/Q^2$.*

Proof. Let P_r the set of the primes p such that $f(i) = ai^2+bi+c = rp^2$ for some $i \le n$. It implies that $(2ai+b)^2 - 4arp^2 = D$ and then, $|\frac{2ai+b}{p} - 2\sqrt{ra}| \ll \frac{1}{p^2} \ll \frac{1}{Q^2}$. We observe that all the fractions $\frac{2ai+b}{p}$, $1 \le i \le n$, $Q \le p < 2Q$ are all distinct. Otherwise $(2ai+b)p' = (2ai'+b)p$ and then $p \mid 2ai+b$. But it would imply that $p \mid D$, which is not possible. On the other hand $\left|\frac{2ai+b}{p} - \frac{2ai'+b}{p'}\right| \ge \frac{1}{pp'} \gg \frac{1}{Q^2}$. Thus, the numbers of primes $p \in P_r$ lying in $[Q,2Q]$ is $\ll 1$. We finish the proof observing that $r \le f(n)/Q^2 \ll n^2/Q^2$. □

Now, if we split the interval $[n^{2/3}, Cn]$ in dyadic intervals and apply lemma above to each interval to obtain $|S_1(n)| \ll n^{2/3}\log n$.

To estimate $S_3(n) = \sum_{n^{2/3}<p<Cn,\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f} \alpha^*_p(n)$ we start by writing

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha^*_p(n) &= \left[\frac{n-\nu_{p,1}}{p}\right] + \left[\frac{n-\nu_{p,2}}{p}\right] + 2\\ &= \frac{2n}{p} + \left(\frac12 - \frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}\right) + \left(\frac12 - \frac{\nu_{p,2}}{p}\right) + \frac12 - \left\{\frac{n-\nu_{p,1}}{p}\right\} + \frac12 - \left\{\frac{n-\nu_{p,2}}{p}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$S_3(n) = n \sum_{n^{2/3}<p<Cn} \frac{(1+(D/p))\log p}{p} \tag{2.19}$$

$$+ \sum_{\substack{n^{2/3}<p<Cn \\ 0\le\nu<p \\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} \left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\nu}{p}\right)\log p + \sum_{\substack{n^{2/3}<p<Cn \\ 0\le\nu<p \\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} \left(\frac{1}{2}-\left\{\frac{n-\nu}{p}\right\}\right)\log p \tag{2.20}$$

$$= n \sum_{n^{2/3}<p<Cn} \frac{(1+(D/p))\log p}{p-1} + O(n^{2/3}) \tag{2.21}$$

$$+ \sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p<Cn \\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} \left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\nu}{p}\right)\log p + \sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p<Cn \\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} \left(\frac{1}{2}-\left\{\frac{n-\nu}{p}\right\}\right)\log p \tag{2.22}$$

Putting this in (2.17) and then in (2.12) we obtain

$$\log L_n(f) = 2n\log n + n\left(\log a - 2 - \sum_{p\mid 2aD}\sum_{k\ge 1}\frac{s(f,p^k)\log p}{p^k}\right) \tag{2.23}$$
$$- \sum_{\substack{p<Cn \\ p\nmid 2aD}} \frac{(1+(D/p))\log p}{p-1} + S_2(n) - T_1(n) - T_2(n) + O(n^{2/3}\log n)$$

where

$$S_2(n) = \sum_{\substack{p<Cn \\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \beta_p^*(n)\log p \tag{2.24}$$

$$T_1(n) = \sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p<Cn \\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} \left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\nu}{p}\right)\log p \tag{2.25}$$

$$T_2(n) = \sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p<Cn \\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} \left(\frac{1}{2}-\left\{\frac{n-\nu}{p}\right\}\right)\log p. \tag{2.26}$$

Sums $T_1(n)$ and $T_2(n)$ will be $o(n)$ as a consequence of theorem 1.2. But it is not completely obvious and we will do it in detail in the next subsection.

Now we will simplify (2.23) a little more in the next lemma.

Lemma 2.7.

$$\log L_n(f) = n\log n + cn + S_2(n) - T_1(n) - T_2(n) + O(n^{2/3}\log n), \tag{2.27}$$

where

$$c=\log a-\log C-2+\gamma-\sum_{p\nmid 2aD}\frac{(d/p)\log p}{p-1}+\sum_{p\mid 2aD}\log p\Big(\frac{1}{p-1}-\sum_{k\ge 1}\frac{s(f,p^k)}{p^k}\Big)$$

and $S_2(n)$, $T_1(n)$ *and* $T_2(n)$ *are as in* (2.24), (2.25) *and* (2.26).

Proof. Let $D=l^2d$ where d is a fundamental discriminant. First we observe that $(D/p)=(l/p)^2(d/p)$ and that if $p\nmid D$ then $(D/p)=(d/p)$. As a consequence of the prime number theorem on arithmetic progressions we know that the sum $\sum_p\frac{(d/p)\log p}{p-1}$ is convergent. On the other hand, the well known estimate $\sum_{p\le x}\frac{\log p}{p-1}=\log x-\gamma+o(1)$ where γ is the Euler constant, implies that

$$\sum_{\substack{p<Cn\\ p\nmid 2aD}}\frac{(1+(D/p))\log p}{p-1}=\log n+\log C-\gamma-\sum_{p\mid 2aD}\frac{\log p}{p-1}+\sum_{p\nmid 2aD}\frac{(d/p)\log p}{p-1}+o(1). \tag{2.28}$$

Finally we put (2.28) in (2.23). □

2.6. **Equidistribution of the roots** $\pmod p$ **of a quadratic polynomial.** Now we develop a technology to prove that $T_1(n)$, $T_2(n)$ and other similar sums which will appear in the estimate of $S_2(n)$ are all $o(n)$.

These sums are all of the form

$$\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\le x,\ p\in S\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0\pmod p}}a(\nu,p,x)\log p \tag{2.29}$$

for some function $a(\nu,p,x)\ll 1$. By partial summation we also get easily that

$$\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\le x,\ p\in S\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0\pmod p}}a(\nu,p,x)\log p=\log x\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\le x,\ p\in S\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0\pmod p}}a(\nu,p,x)-\int_1^x\frac{1}{t}\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\le t,\ p\in S\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0\pmod p}}a(\nu,p,x) \tag{2.30}$$

$$=\log x\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\le x,\ p\in S\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0\pmod p}}a(\nu,p,x)+o(x/\log x). \tag{2.31}$$

Hence, to prove that the sums (2.29) are $o(x)$ we must prove that

$$\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\le x,\ p\in S\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0\pmod p}}a(\nu,p,x)=o(x/\log x).$$

Theorem 1.2 implies, in particular, that for any arithmetic progression S and for any piecewise continuos function g in $[0,1]$ such that $\int_0^1 g = 0$ we have that

$$\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\le x,\ p\in S\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} g(\nu/p) = o(x/\log x). \tag{2.32}$$

Lemma 2.8. *Let f be an irreducible polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$. We have that the sums $T_1(n)$ and $T_2(n)$ defined in* (2.25) *and* (2.26) *are both $o(n)$.*

Proof. To prove that $T_1(n) = o(n)$ we apply (2.32) to the function $g(x) = x - 1/2$.

To prove that $T_2(n) = o(n)$ the strategy is to split the range of the primes in small intervals such that n/p are almost constant in each interval. We take H a large, but a fixed number and we divide the interval $[1, Cn]$ in H intervals $L_h = (\frac{h-1}{H}Cn, \frac{h}{H}Cn],\ h = 1,\dots,H$. Now we write

$$\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p<n\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} \left(\left\{\frac{n-\nu}{p}\right\} - \frac{1}{2}\right) = \Sigma_{31} + \Sigma_{32} + \Sigma_{33} + O(n/(H^{1/3}\log n)) \tag{2.33}$$

where

$$\Sigma_{31} = \sum_{H^{2/3}\le h\le H} \sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} \left(\left\{\frac{H}{h} - \frac{\nu}{p}\right\} - \frac{1}{2}\right)$$

$$\Sigma_{32} = \sum_{H^{2/3}\le h\le H} \sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p\\ \frac{\nu}{p}\notin[\frac{H}{h},\frac{H}{h-1}]}} \left(\left\{\frac{n}{p} - \frac{\nu}{p}\right\} - \left\{\frac{H}{h} - \frac{\nu}{p}\right\}\right)$$

$$\Sigma_{33} = \sum_{H^{2/3}\le h\le H} \sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p\\ \frac{\nu}{p}\in[\frac{H}{h},\frac{H}{h-1}]}} \left(\left\{\frac{n}{p} - \frac{\nu}{p}\right\} - \left\{\frac{H}{h} - \frac{\nu}{p}\right\}\right).$$

To estimate Σ_{31} we apply (2.32) with the function $\left\{\frac{H}{h} - x\right\} - \frac{1}{2}$ in each L_h and we obtain

$$\Sigma_{31} = o(Hn/\log n) = o(n\log n) \tag{2.34}$$

since H is a constant.

To bound Σ_{32} we observe that if $p \in L_h$ and $\frac{\nu}{p} \notin [\frac{H}{h}, \frac{H}{h-1}]$, then

$$0 \le \left\{\frac{n}{p} - \frac{\nu}{p}\right\} - \left\{\frac{H}{h} - \frac{\nu}{p}\right\} = \frac{n}{p} - \frac{H}{h} \le \frac{H}{h(h-1)}.$$

Thus

$$|\Sigma_{32}| \ll \sum_{H^{2/3}\le h<H}\sum_{p\in L_h}\frac{H}{h^2} \ll \sum_{H^{2/3}\le h<H}\sum_{p\in L_h}\frac{1}{H^{1/3}} \ll \frac{\pi(n)}{H^{1/3}} \ll \frac{n}{H^{1/3}\log n}. \tag{2.35}$$

To bound Σ_{33} first we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{33} &\ll \sum_{H^{2/3}\le h<H}\ \sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p\\ \frac{\nu}{p}\in[\frac{H}{h},\frac{H}{h-1}]}} 1\\ &= \sum_{H^{2/3}\le h<H}\ \sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} \left(\chi_{[H/h,H/(h-1)]}(\nu/p)-\frac{H}{h(h-1)}\right)\\ &+ \sum_{H^{2/3}\le h<H}\ \sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} \frac{H}{h(h-1)},\end{aligned}$$

where, here and later, $\chi_{[a,b]}(x)$ denotes the characteristic function of the interval $[a,b]$.

Theorem 1.2 implies that

$$\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} \left(\chi_{[H/h,H/(h-1)]}(\nu/p)-\frac{H}{h(h-1)}\right) = o(n/\log n).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{33} &\ll \sum_{H^{2/3}\le h<H} o\left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right) + \sum_{H^{2/3}\le h<H}\ \sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p}} \frac{1}{H^{1/3}}\\ &\ll o(n/\log n)+\frac{\pi(n)}{H^{1/3}} \ll o(n/\log n)+O(n/H^{1/3}\log n).\end{aligned} \tag{2.36}$$

Estimates (2.34), (2.35) and (2.36) imply $\Sigma_3 \ll o(n/\log n)+n/(H^{1/3}\log n)$. Since H can be chosen arbitrarily large we have that $\Sigma_3 = o(n/\log n)$ which finish the proof. $\square$

To present lemma 2.10 we need some preparation.

For primes $p\in\mathcal{P}_f$ the congruence $f(x)\equiv 0 \pmod p$ has exactly two solutions, say $0\le \nu_{p,1},\ \nu_{p,2}<p$.

In some parts of the proof of theorem 1.1 we will need estimate some quantities depending on $\min(\nu_{p,1},\nu_{p,2})$. For this reason it is convenient to know how they are related.

If $f(x)=ax^2+bx+c$ and $p\in\mathcal{P}_f$ then $\nu_{p,1}+\nu_{p,2}\equiv -b/a \pmod p$. Next lemma will give more information when the prime p belongs to some particular arithmetic progression.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $q = a/(a,b)$, $l = b/(a,b)$. For any r, $(r,q) = 1$ and for any prime $p \equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q$ and $p \in \mathcal{P}_f$ we have*

$$\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p} + \frac{\nu_{p,2}}{p} \equiv \frac{r}{q} - \frac{l}{pq} \pmod 1 \tag{2.37}$$

Proof. To avoid confusions we denote by $\overline{q}_p$ and $\overline{p}_q$ the inverses of $q \pmod p$ and $p \pmod q$ respectively. From the obvious congruence $q\overline{q}_p + p\overline{p}_q \equiv 1 \pmod{pq}$ we deduce that $\frac{\overline{q}_p}{p} + \frac{\overline{p}_q}{q} - \frac{1}{pq} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $p \equiv l\overline{r}_q \pmod q$ we obtain $\frac{\overline{q}_p}{p} \equiv \frac{1}{pq} - \frac{r\overline{l}_q}{q} \pmod 1$. Thus

$$\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p} + \frac{\nu_{p,2}}{p} \equiv \frac{-l\overline{q}_p}{p} \equiv -l\left(\frac{1}{pq} - \frac{r\overline{l}_q}{q}\right) \equiv \frac{r}{q} - \frac{l}{pq} \pmod 1.$$

□

Since the two roots are symmetric respect to $\frac{r}{2q} - \frac{l}{2pq}$, necessarily one of then lies in $\left[\frac{r}{2q} - \frac{l}{2pq}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{r}{2q} - \frac{l}{2pq}\right) \pmod 1$ and the other in the complementary set.

Definition 2. *For $(r,q) = 1$, $1 \le r \le q$, $p \equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q$ and $p \in \mathcal{P}_f$ we define $\nu_{p,1}$ the root of $f(x) \equiv \pmod p$ such that*

$$\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p} \in T_{rp} = \left[\frac{r}{2q} - \frac{l}{2pq}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{r}{2q} - \frac{l}{2pq}\right) \pmod 1,$$

and we define $\nu_{p,2}$ the root of $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod p$ such that $\frac{\nu_{p,2}}{p} \in [0,1) \setminus T_{rp}$.

Lemma 2.10. *Assume the notation above. Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2, c_1, c_2$ be constants and $g_1(x), g_2(x)$ two linear functions satisfying that*

$$J_n(p) = \left[g_1\left(\frac{n}{p}\right) + \frac{c_1}{p}, g_2\left(\frac{n}{p}\right) + \frac{c_2}{p}\right] \subset T_{rp}$$

for any prime $p \in K_n = [\alpha_1 n + \beta_1, \alpha_2 n + \beta_2]$. We have

$$\sum_{\substack{p \in K_n \cap \mathcal{P}_f \\ p \equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q}} \left(\chi_{J_n(p)}\left(\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}\right) - 2|J_n(p)|\right) \log p = o(n) \tag{2.38}$$

where χ_I is the characteristic function of the set I.

Proof. Since $J_n(p) \subset T_{rp}$ then $\nu_2/p \notin J_n(p)$ and we can write

$$\sum_{\substack{p \in K_n \cap \mathcal{P}_f \\ p \equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q}} \chi_{J_n(p)}\left(\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}\right) \log p = \sum_{\substack{1 \le \nu \le p \in K_n, \\ f(\nu) \equiv 0 \pmod p \\ p \equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q}} \chi_{J_n(p)}\left(\frac{\nu}{p}\right) \log p$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{p \in K_n \cap \mathcal{P}_f \\ p \equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q}} 2|J_n(p)| \log p = \sum_{\substack{1 \le \nu \le p \in K_n, \\ f(\nu) \equiv 0 \pmod p \\ p \equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q}} |J_n(p)| \log p.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{\substack{p\in K_n\cap\mathcal{P}_f\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q}}\left(\chi_{J_n(p)}\left(\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}\right)-2|J_n(p)|\right)\log p=\sum_{\substack{1\le\nu\le p\in K_n,\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0\pmod p\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q}}\left(\chi_{J_n(p)}\left(\frac{\nu}{p}\right)-|J_n(p)|\right)\log p.$$

To prove the lemma is enough to prove that

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le\nu\le p\in K_n,\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0\pmod p\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q}}\left(\chi_{J_n(p)}\left(\frac{\nu}{p}\right)-|J_n(p)|\right)=o(n/\log n). \tag{2.39}$$

We proceed as above. We split K_n in intervals $L_h=(\frac{h-1}{H}n,\frac{h}{H}n]$ of length n/H and two extra intervals $I,\ F$ (the initial and the final intervals) of length $\le n/H$. Here h runs over a suitable set of consecutive integers $\mathcal{H}$ of cardinality $\ll(\alpha_2-\alpha_1)H$.

Let I_h denote the interval $[g_1(H/h)+c_1H/(nh),g_2(H/h)+c_2H/(nh)]$.

We write

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le\nu\le p\in K_n,\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0\pmod p\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q}}\left(\chi_{J_n(p)}\left(\frac{\nu}{p}\right)-|J_n(p)|\right)=\Sigma_1+\Sigma_2+\Sigma_3+\Sigma_4 \tag{2.40}$$

where

$$\Sigma_1=\sum_{h\in\mathcal{H}}\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0\pmod p\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q}}\left(\chi_{I_h}\left(\frac{\nu}{p}\right)-|I_h|\right)$$

$$\Sigma_2=\sum_{h\in\mathcal{H}}\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0\pmod p\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q}}(|I_h|-|J_n(p)|)$$

$$\Sigma_3=\sum_{h\in\mathcal{H}}\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0\pmod p\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q}}\left(\chi_{J_n(p)}\left(\frac{\nu}{p}\right)-\chi_{I_h}\left(\frac{\nu}{p}\right)\right)$$

$$\Sigma_4=\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in I\cup F\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0\pmod p\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q}}\left(\chi_{I_h}\left(\frac{\nu}{p}\right)-|J_n(p)|\right).$$

The inner sum in Σ_1 can be estimated as we did in lemma 2.8, (with the function $g(x)=\chi_I(x)-|I|$ instead of $g(x)=x-1/2$), and we get again that $\Sigma_1=o(n/\log n)$.

To estimate Σ_2 and Σ_3 we observe that if $p\in L_h$ then $J_n(p)$ and I_h are almost equal. Actually, comparing the end points of both intervals and because g is a linear function,

we have $|J_n(p)| - |I_h| \ll \min(1, H/h^2)$ and $\chi_{J_n(p)}(x) = \chi_{I_h}(x)$ except for a set E_h of measure $\ll \min(1, H/h^2)$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_2 &\ll \sum_{h\in\mathcal{H}}\sum_{p\in L_n} \min(1, H/h^2) \ll \sum_{h\le H^{2/3}}\sum_{p\in L_h} + \sum_{H^{2/3}<h\in\mathcal{H}}\sum_{p\in L_h}\frac{1}{H^{1/3}}\\ &\ll \pi(n/H^{1/3}) + \frac{1}{H^{1/3}}\pi(\alpha_1 n+\alpha_2) \ll n/(H^{1/3}\log n).\end{aligned}$$

To bound Σ_3 first we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_3 &\ll \sum_{h\in\mathcal{H}}\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q}} \chi_{E_h}(\nu/p)\\ &= \sum_{h\in\mathcal{H}}\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q}} (\chi_{E_h}(\nu/p) - |E_h|) + \sum_{h\in\mathcal{H}}\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q}} |E_h|.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.2 implies that

$$\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q}} (\chi_{E_h}(\nu/p) - |E_h|) = o(n/\log n).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{h\in\mathcal{H}}\sum_{\substack{0\le\nu<p\in L_h\\ f(\nu)\equiv 0 \pmod p\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q}} |E_h| &\ll \sum_{h\le H^{2/3}}\sum_{p\in L_h} 1 + \sum_{H^{2/3}<h\in\mathcal{H}}\sum_{p\in L_h}\frac{H}{h^2}\\ &\ll \pi(n/H^{1/3}) + \frac{1}{H^{1/3}}\pi(\alpha_1 n+\alpha_2)\\ &\ll \frac{n}{H^{1/3}\log n}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\Sigma_3 \ll o(n/\log n) + n/(H^{1/3}\log n)$.

Finally we estimate Σ_4. We observe that

$$|\Sigma_4| \le \sum_{p\in I} 1 + \sum_{p\in F} 1 \ll n/(H\log n)$$

as a consequence of the prime number theorem. Then

$$\Sigma_1+\Sigma_2+\Sigma_3+\Sigma_4 = O(n/(H^{1/3}\log n)) + O(n/(H\log n)) + o(n/\log n)$$

which finish the proof because we can take H arbitrarily large. $\square$

2.7. **Estimate of $S_2(n)$ and end of the proof.**

Lemma 2.11.

$$S_2(n) = n\Big(1 + \log C - \log 4 + \frac{1}{\phi(q)}\sum_{(r,q)=1}\log(1+\frac{r}{q})\Big) + o(n) \tag{2.41}$$

Proof. Following the notation of lemma 2.9 we split

$$S_2(n) = \sum_{\substack{(r,q)=1\\1\le r\le q}} S_{2r}(n) + \sum_{p\le l}\beta_p^*(n)\log p = \sum_{\substack{(r,q)=1\\1\le r\le q}} S_{2r}(n) + O(1)$$

where

$$S_{2r}(n) = \sum_{\substack{l<p\le Cn\\ p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q}} \beta_p^*(n)\log p. \tag{2.42}$$

Since $p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q$, lemma 2.9 implies that $\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}+\frac{\nu_{p,2}}{p}\equiv \frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq} \pmod 1$. We observe also that, since $p>l$ we have that $0<\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}\le 1$.

Now we will check that

$$\beta_p^*(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if} \quad \frac{n}{p}\ge \frac12+\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}\\ \chi_{[\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq},\frac{n}{p}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p), & \text{if} \quad \frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}<\frac{n}{p}<\frac12+\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}\\ \chi_{[\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq},\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p), & \text{if} \quad \frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}\le\frac{n}{p}\le\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}\\ \chi_{[\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{n}{p},\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p) & \text{if} \quad \frac{n}{p}<\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq} \end{cases}$$

We observe that $\beta_p^*(n)=1$ if and only if $\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}\le\frac{n}{p}$ or $\frac{\nu_{p,2}}{p}\le\frac{n}{p}$. We remind that

$$\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}\le\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}<\frac12+\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq} \tag{2.43}$$

Also we observe that lemma 2.9 implies that

$$\frac{\nu_{p,2}}{p} = \begin{cases} \frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p} & \text{if } \frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}\le\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}\\ \frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}+1 & \text{if } \frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}>\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}. \end{cases} \tag{2.44}$$

- Assume $\frac{n}{p}\ge\frac12+\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}$. Then $\nu_{p,1}<p\left(\frac12+\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}\right)<n$, so $\beta_p^*(n)=1$
- Assume $\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}<\frac{n}{p}<\frac12+\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}$.
  - If $\chi_{[\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq},\frac{n}{p}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p)=1$ then $\nu_{p,1}\le n$, so $\beta_p^*(n)=1$.
  - If $\chi_{[\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq},\frac{n}{p}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p)=0$ then $\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}>\frac{n}{p}>\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}$. Relations (2.43) and (2.44) imply that $\frac{\nu_{p,2}}{p}=1+\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}>\frac12+\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}>\frac{n}{p}$. Since $\nu_{p,1}>n$ and $\nu_{p,2}>n$ we get $\beta_p^*(n)=0$.
- Assume $\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}\le\frac{n}{p}\le\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}$.

- If $\chi_{[\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq},\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p)=1$ then (2.44) imply that $0<\frac{\nu_{p,2}}{p}\le\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}$, which implies that $\nu_{p,2}\le n$, so $\beta_p^*(n)=1$.
- If $\chi_{[\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq},\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p)=0$ then $\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}>\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}\ge\frac{n}{p}$ and relation (2.44) imply that $\frac{\nu_{p,2}}{p}=\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}+1>\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}\ge\frac{n}{p}$. Since $\nu_{p,1}>n$ and $\nu_{p,2}>n$ we get $\beta_p^*(n)=0$.

- Assume $\frac{n}{p}<\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}$.
  - If $\chi_{[\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{n}{p},\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p)=1$ then $\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}\le\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}$ and relation (2.44) implies that $\frac{\nu_{p,2}}{p}=\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}\le\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-(\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{n}{p})=\frac{n}{p}$, so $\beta_p^*(n)=1$
  - If $\chi_{[\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{n}{p},\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p)=0$ we distinguish two cases:
    * If $\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2q}\le\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}<\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{n}{p}$ then $\frac{\nu_{1,p}}{p}\ge\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2q}>\frac{n}{p}$, and also we have that $\frac{\nu_{p,2}}{p}=\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}>\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\left(\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{n}{p}\right)=\frac{n}{p}$. Thus $\beta_p^*(n)=0$
    * If $\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}<\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}<\frac{1}{2}+\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}$ then $\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}>\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}\right)>\frac{n}{p}$. On the other hand, $\frac{\nu_{p,2}}{p}=\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{\nu_{p,1}}{p}+1>\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}\right)+1=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq}>\frac{n}{p}$. Thus, again we have that $\beta_p^*(n)=0$.

Now we split $S_{2r}(n)=\sum_{i=1}^4 S_{2ri}(n)$ according the ranges of the primes involved in lemma above.

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{2r1}(n) &= \sum_{\substack{l<p\le\frac{n+l/(2q)}{1/2+r/(2q)}\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q\\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \log p\\
S_{2r2}(n) &= \sum_{\substack{\frac{n+l/(2q)}{1/2+r/(2q)}<p<\frac{n+l/q}{r/q}\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q\\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \chi_{[\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq},\frac{n}{p}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p)\log p\\
S_{2r3}(n) &= \sum_{\substack{\frac{q}{r}(n+\frac{l}{q})\le p\le\frac{2q}{r}(n+\frac{l}{q})\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q\\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \chi_{[\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq},\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p)\log p\\
S_{2r4}(n) &= \sum_{\substack{\frac{2q}{r}(n+\frac{l}{2q})<p<Cn\\ p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q\\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \chi_{[\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{n}{p},\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p)\log p.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $(q,D)=1$ and the primes are odd numbers, the primes $p\equiv lr^{-1}\pmod q$, $p\in\mathcal{P}_f$ lie in a set of $\phi(4qD)/(2\phi(q))$ arithmetic progressions modulo $4qD$. The prime

number theorem for arithmetic progressions implies that

$$\sum_{\substack{p\le x\\ p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q,\ p\in P_f}} \log p \sim \frac{x}{2\phi(q)} \tag{2.45}$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{ax<p\le bx\\ p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q,\ p\in P_f}} \frac{\log p}{p} = \frac{\log(b/a)}{2\phi(q)} + o(1) \tag{2.46}$$

We will use these estimates and lema 2.10 to estimate $S_{2ri}(n),\ i=1,2,3,4.$

By (2.45) we have

$$S_{2r1}(n) = \frac{n}{\phi(q)}\frac{q}{q+r} + o(n). \tag{2.47}$$

To estimate S_{5r2} we write

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{2r2}(n) &= \sum_{\substack{\frac{n+l/(2q)}{1/2+r/(2q)}<p<\frac{n+l/q}{r/q}\\ p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q}} \chi_{[\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq},\frac{n}{p}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p)\log p\\
&= \sum_{\substack{\frac{n+l/(2q)}{1/2+r/(2q)}<p<\frac{n+l/q}{r/q}\\ p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q}} \Big(\frac{2n}{p}-\frac{r}{q}+\frac{l}{pq}\Big)\log p\\
&+ \sum_{\substack{\frac{n+l/(2q)}{1/2+r/(2q)}<p<\frac{n+l/q}{r/q}\\ p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q}} \Big(\chi_{[\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq},\frac{n}{p}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p) - 2\Big(\frac{n}{p}-\frac{r}{2q}+\frac{l}{2pq}\Big)\Big)\log p
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.10 implies that the last sum is $o(n)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{5r2} &= \sum_{\substack{\frac{n+l/(2q)}{1/2+r/(2q)}<p<\frac{n+l/q}{r/q}\\ p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q\\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \Big(\frac{2n}{p}-\frac{r}{q}\Big)\log p + o(n)\\
&= 2n\sum_{\substack{\frac{n+l/(2q)}{1/2+r/(2q)}<p<\frac{n+l/q}{r/q}\\ p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q\\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \frac{\log p}{p} - \frac{r}{q}\sum_{\substack{\frac{n+l/(2q)}{1/2+r/(2q)}<p<\frac{n+l/q}{r/q}\\ p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q\\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \log p + o(n)\\
&= \frac{n}{\phi(q)}\log\Big(\frac12+\frac{q}{2r}\Big) - \frac{n}{\phi(q)}\Big(\frac12-\frac{r}{q+r}\Big) + o(n)
\end{aligned}$$

by (2.45) and (2.46).

To estimate $S_{2r3}(n)$ we write

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{2r3}(n) &= \sum_{\substack{\frac{q}{r}(n+\frac{l}{q})\le p\le \frac{2q}{r}(n+\frac{l}{q}) \\ p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q \\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \Big(\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}\Big)\log p \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{\frac{q}{r}(n+\frac{l}{q})\le p\le \frac{2q}{r}(n+\frac{l}{q}) \\ p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q \\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \Big(\chi_{[\frac{r}{2q}-\frac{l}{2pq},\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p) - \Big(\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}\Big)\Big)\log p \\
&= \frac{n}{2\phi(q)} + o(n)
\end{aligned}$$

by (2.45) and lema 2.10.

To estimate $S_{2r4}(n)$ we write

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{2r4}(n) &= \sum_{\substack{\frac{2q}{r}(n+\frac{l}{2q})<p<Cn \\ p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q \\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \Big(\frac{2n}{p}+\frac{2l}{pq}\Big)\log p \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\frac{2q}{r}(n+\frac{l}{2q})<p<Cn \\ p\equiv lr^{-1} \pmod q \\ p\in\mathcal{P}_f}} \Big(\chi_{[\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}-\frac{n}{p},\frac{r}{q}-\frac{l}{pq}]}(\nu_{p,1}/p) - \Big(\frac{2n}{p}+\frac{2l}{pq}\Big)\Big)\log p \\
&= \frac{n}{\phi(q)}\Big(\log C - \log(2q/r)\Big) + o(n)
\end{aligned}$$

by (2.46) and lemma 2.10.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{2r}(n) &= S_{2r1}(n) + S_{2r2}(n) + S_{2r3}(n) + S_{2r4}(n) + O(1) \\
&= \frac{n}{\phi(q)}\frac{q}{q+r} + o(n) \\
&+ \frac{n}{\phi(q)}\log\Big(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{q}{2r}\Big) - \frac{n}{\phi(q)}\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{r}{q+r}\Big) + o(n) \\
&+ \frac{n}{2\phi(q)} + o(n) \\
&+ \frac{n}{\phi(q)}\Big(\log C - \log(2q/r)\Big) + o(n) \\
&= \frac{n}{\phi(q)}\Big(1 + \log C - \log 4 + \log(1+r/q)\Big) + o(n).
\end{aligned}$$

Now sum in all $r \le q$, $(r,q)=1$ to finish the estimate of $S_2(n)$. □

Finally we substitute (2.41) in (2.27) to conclude the proof of theorem 1.1.

3. Computation of the constant B_f

The sum $\sum_p \frac{(d/p)\log p}{p-1}$, appearing in the formula of the constant B_f converges very slowly. Next lemma gives an alternative expression for this sum, more convenient to obtain a fast computation.

Lemma 3.1.

$$\sum_p \frac{(d/p)\log p}{p-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{\zeta'(2^k)}{\zeta(2^k)} - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{L'(2^k,\chi_d)}{L(2^k,\chi_d)} + \sum_{p|d} s_p. \tag{3.1}$$

where $s_p = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{\log p}{p^{2^k}-1}$.

Proof. For $s > 1$ we consider the function $G_d(s) = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^s}\right)^{(d/p)}$. Taking the derivative of the logarithm of $G_d(s)$ we obtain that

$$\frac{G_d'(s)}{G_d(s)} = \sum_p \frac{(d/p)\log p}{p^s - 1}. \tag{3.2}$$

Since $L(s,\chi_d) = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{(d/p)}{p}^s\right)^{-1}$ we have

$$G_d(s)L(s,\chi_d) = \prod_p \left(1-\frac{1}{p^s}\right)^{(d/p)}\left(1 - \frac{(d/p)}{p^s}\right)^{-1} \tag{3.3}$$

$$= \prod_{(d/p)=-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{2s}}\right)^{-1} \tag{3.4}$$

$$= \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{2s}}\right)^{\frac{(d/p)-1}{2}} \prod_{p|d}\left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{2s}}\right)^{1/2} \tag{3.5}$$

$$= G_d^{1/2}(2s)\zeta^{1/2}(2s)T^{1/2}(2s) \tag{3.6}$$

where $T(s) = \prod_{p|d}\left(1 - \frac{1}{p^s}\right)$.

The derivative of the logarithm gives

$$\frac{G_d'(s)}{G_d(s)} - \frac{G_d'(2s)}{G_d(2s)} = \frac{\zeta'(2s)}{\zeta(2s)} + \frac{T_d'(2s)}{T_d(2s)} - \frac{L'(s,\chi_d)}{L(s,\chi_d)}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{G_d'(s)}{G_d(s)} - \frac{G_d'(2^m s)}{G_d(2^m s)} = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1}\left(\frac{G_d'(2^k s)}{G_d(2^k s)} - \frac{G_d'(2^{k+1}s)}{G_d(2^{k+1}s)}\right) \tag{3.7}$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{m}\frac{\zeta'(2^k s)}{\zeta(2^k s)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m}\frac{T_d'(2^k s)}{T_d(2^k s)} - \sum_{k=0}^{m-1}\frac{L'(2^k s,\chi_d)}{L(2^k s,\chi_d)}. \tag{3.8}$$

By (3.2) we have that for $s \geq 2$, $|\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)}| \leq \sum_{n\geq 2} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^s-1} \leq \frac{\log 2}{2^s-1} + \sum_{n\geq 3} \frac{\log n}{n^s-1} \leq \frac{4}{3}\frac{\log 2}{2^s} + \frac{9}{8}\sum_{n\geq 3} \frac{\log n}{n^s} \leq \frac{4}{3}\frac{\log 2}{2^s} + \frac{9}{8}\int_2^\infty \frac{\log x}{x^s}dx = \frac{4}{3}\frac{\log 2}{2^s} + \frac{9}{8}\Big(\frac{\log 2}{2^{s-1}(s-1)} + \frac{1}{2^{s-1}(s-1)^2}\Big) \leq \frac{1}{2^s(s-1)}\Big(\frac{20\log 2+8}{9}\Big) \leq \frac{5}{2}\cdot\frac{2^{-s}}{s-1}$. Thus, $|\frac{\zeta'(2^k)}{\zeta(2^k)}| \leq \frac{5}{2}\cdot\frac{2^{-2^k}}{2^k-1}$. The same estimate holds for $|\frac{G_d'(2^k)}{G_d(2^k)}|$, $|\frac{T_d'(2^k)}{T_d(2^k)}|$ and $|\frac{L'(2^k,\chi_d)}{L(2^k,\chi_d)}|$. When $m \to \infty$ and then $s \to 1$ we get

$$\sum_p \frac{(d/p)\log p}{p-1} = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\zeta'(2^k)}{\zeta(2^k)} - \sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{L'(2^k,\chi_d)}{L(2^k,\chi_d)} + \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{T_d'(2^k)}{T_d(2^k)}. \tag{3.9}$$

Finally we observe that $\frac{T_d'(2^k)}{T_d(2^k)} = \sum_{p|d} \frac{\log p}{p^{2^k}-1}$, so $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{T_d'(2^k)}{T_d(2^k)} = \sum_{p|d} s_p$. □

The advantage of the lemma above is that the series involved converge very fast. For example, $\sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{L'(2^k,\chi_d)}{L(2^k,\chi_d)} = \sum_{k=0}^6 \frac{L'(2^k,\chi_d)}{L(2^k,\chi_d)} + Error$ with $|Error| \leq 10^{-40}$.

Hence we can write $B_f = C_0 + C_d + C(f)$ where C_0 is an universal constant, C_d depends only on d, and $C(f)$ depends on f. More precisely,

$$C_0 = \gamma - 1 - 2\log 2 - \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\zeta'(2^k)}{\zeta(2^k)} = -1.1725471674190148508587521528364$$

$$C_d = \sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{L'(2^k,\chi_d)}{L(2^k,\chi_d)} - \sum_{p|d} s_p$$

$$C(f) = \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\substack{1\leq r\leq q\\(r,q)=1}} \log\Big(1+\frac{r}{q}\Big) + \log a + \sum_{p|2aD} \log p\Big(\frac{1+(d/p)}{p-1} - \sum_{k\geq 1}\frac{s(f,p^k)}{p^k}\Big).$$

The values of s_p and $\sum_{k\geq 0} L'(2^k,\chi_d)/L(2^k,\chi_d)$, can be calculated with MAGMA with high precision. We include some values of s_p,

$$s_2 = 0.27998767337085980720045920637\,6\ldots$$

$$s_3 = 0.1512266865987270763563182752\,33\ldots$$

$$s_5 = 0.0696432606240111952674429443\,07\ldots$$

$$s_7 = 0.0413509282178151186562189392\,60\ldots$$

$$s_{17} = 0.0098714693132437756871971326\,26\ldots$$

some values of C_d,

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_{-4} &= +0.34653843573689598754 9 - s_2 &&= +0.06655076236603618034 9\\
C_{-8} &= -0.07669409306648531118 4 - s_2 &&= -0.35668176643734511838 4\\
C_{8} &= +0.80990310467373878738 4 - s_2 &&= +0.52991543130287898018 4\\
C_{-3} &= +0.58627240029714952364 9 - s_3 &&= +0.43504571369842244729 2\\
C_{5} &= +1.17244960355126179452 8 - s_5 &&= +1.10280634292725059926 0\\
C_{-7} &= -0.07002283799044498881 5 - s_7 &&= -0.11137376620826010747 1\\
C_{12} &= +0.56458863932586596198 4 - s_2 - s_3 &&= +0.13337427935627907842 7\\
C_{-15} &= -0.48632069290326175840 5 - s_3 - s_5 &&= -0.70719064012600003002 8\\
C_{17} &= +0.28910934378402552961 0 - s_{17} &&= +0.27923787447078175392 2
\end{aligned}
$$

and some values of $C(f(x))$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
C(x^2+1) &= (3\log 2)/2 &&= 1.03972077083991796412 5\dots\\
C(x^2+2) &= (3\log 2)/2 &&= 1.03972077083991796412 5\dots\\
C(x^2-2) &= (3\log 2)/2 &&= 1.03972077083991796412 5\dots\\
C(x^2+x+1) &= \log 2 + (\log 3)/6 &&= 0.87624922867129692464 9\dots\\
C(x^2+x-1) &= \log 2 + (\log 5)/(20) &&= 0.77361907618165032814 7\dots\\
C(x^2+x+2) &= \log 2 + (\log 7)/(42) &&= 0.73947837458507181668 1\dots\\
C(x^2+2x-2) &= (3\log 2)/2 + (\log 3)/6 &&= 1.22282281895126957935 8\dots\\
C(2x^2+1) &= 3\log 2 &&= 2.07944154167983592825 1\dots\\
C(2x^2-1) &= 3\log 2 &&= 2.07944154167983592825 1\dots\\
C(2x^2+x+1) &= 2\log 2 + \log 3 + (\log 7)/(42) &&= 1.83809066325318150807 6\dots\\
C(2x^2+x+2) &= \log 2 + (7\log 3)6 + (\log 5)/(20) &&= 2.05533341296111163477 5\dots\\
C(2x^2+x-2) &= \log 2 + \log 3 + (\log(17))/(272) &&= 1.80217569475767344228 3\dots\\
C(2x^2-x+1) &= \log 2 + \log 3 + (\log(7))/(42) &&= 1.83809066325318150807 6\\
C(2x^2-x+2) &= \log 2 + (7\log 3)/6 + (\log 5)/(20) &&= 2.05533341296111163477 5\dots\\
C(2x^2-x-2) &= \log 2 + \log 3 + (\log(17))/(272) &&= 1.80217569475767344228 3\dots\\
C(2x^2+2x+1) &= 3\log 2 &&= 2.07944154167983592825 1\dots\\
C(2x^2+2x-1) &= 3\log 2 + (\log 3)/6 &&= 2.26254358979118754348 4\dots
\end{aligned}
$$

Table below contains the constant $B = B_f$ for all irreducible quadratic polynomial $f(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$ with $0 \le a, |b|, |c| \le 2$. When f_1, f_2 are irreducible quadratic

polynomials such that $f_1(x) = f_2(x+k)$ for some k, we only include one of them since $L_n(f_1) = L_n(f_2) + O(\log n)$.

$f(x)$	d	q	B_f
x^2+1	-4	1	- 0.06627563421306070638...
x^2+2	-8	1	- 0.48950816301644200511...
x^2-2	8	1	+ 0.39709034723782093451...
x^2+x+1	-3	1	+ 0.13874777495070452108...
x^2+x-1	5	1	+ 0.70387825168988607654...
x^2+x+2	-7	1	- 0.54444255904220314164...
x^2+2x-2	8	1	+ 0.18364993088853380692...
$2x^2+1$	-8	1	+ 0.55021260782347595900...
$2x^2-1$	8	1	+ 1.43680980556370005757...
$2x^2+x+1$	-7	2	+ 0.55416972962590654974...
$2x^2+x+2$	-15	2	+ 0.17559560541609675388...
$2x^2+x-2$	17	2	+ 0.90886640180944034534...
$2x^2-x+1$	-7	2	+ 0.55416972962590654974...
$2x^2-x+2$	-15	2	+ 0.17559560541609675388...
$2x^2-x-2$	17	2	+ 0.90886640180944034534...
$2x^2+2x+1$	-4	1	+ 0.97344513662685725774...
$2x^2+2x-1$	12	1	+ 1.22337070172845177105...

Table below shows the error term $E_f(n) = \log L_n(f) - n\log n - B_f n$ for the polynomials above and some values of n.

$f(x)$	x^2+1	x^2+2	x^2-2	x^2+x+1	x^2+x-1	x^2+x+2	x^2+2x-2
$E_f(10^2)$	-18	-36	-7	-6	-12	+9	-17
$E_f(10^3)$	+6	-11	-46	-9	-91	-20	-97
$E_f(10^4)$	-111	-263	-54	+17	-208	-218	-297
$E_f(10^5)$	+34	-761	-466	-654	-253	-2120	-553
$E_f(10^6)$	-2634	-1462	-764	-2528	-1075	+687	-454
$E_f(10^7)$	-1557	-8457	-1472	-1685	-9636	-686	-6336

$f(x)$	$2x^2+1$	$2x^2-1$	$2x^2+x+1$	$2x^2+x+2$	$2x^2+x-2$	$2x^2-x+1$
$E_f(10^2)$	-15	-19	-1	-34	-5	-22
$E_f(10^3)$	-1	-69	+6	+4	-37	-126
$E_f(10^4)$	-301	-233	+18	-295	-198	-43
$E_f(10^5)$	-251	-182	-1289	+27	-1193	+177
$E_f(10^6)$	+1084	-159	+235	+1169	-4856	-3077
$E_f(10^7)$	-14821	-10525	-2553	+1958	-16758	-5459

$f(x)$	$2x^2-x+2$	$2x^2-x-2$	$2x^2+2x+1$	$2x^2+2x-1$
$E_f(10^2)$	-5	-17	-9	-14
$E_f(10^3)$	-123	-18	-89	-41
$E_f(10^4)$	+74	-136	+9	+58
$E_f(10^5)$	-2083	-516	-232	-331
$E_f(10^6)$	-4851	+3532	-2876	-931
$E_f(10^7)$	-18152	+907	-10624	+689

4. Quadratic reducible polynomials

To complete the problem of estimating the least common multiple of quadratic polynomials we will study here the case of reducible quadratic polynomials. Being this case much easier than the irreducible case, we will give a complete description for sake of the completeness.

If $f(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$ with $g = (a, b, c) > 1$, it is easy to check that $\log L_n(f) = \log L_n(f') + O(1)$ where $f'(x) = a'x^2 + b'x + c'$ with $a' = a/g,\ b' = b/g,\ c' = c/g$.

If $f(x) = (ax + b)^2$ with $(a, b) = 1$ then, since $(m^2, n^2) = (m, n)^2$, we have that $L_n((ax + b)^2) = L_n^2(ax + b)$ and we can apply (1.1) to get

$$\log \mathrm{l.c.m.}\{(a+b)^2,\dots,(an+b)^2\} \sim 2n\frac{a}{\phi(a)}\sum_{\substack{1\le k\le a\\(k,a)=1}}\frac{1}{k}. \tag{4.1}$$

Now we consider the more general case $f(x) = (ax + b)(cx + d),\ (a, b) = (c, d) = 1$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $f(x) = (ax + b)(cx + d)$ with $(a, b) = (c, d) = 1$ and $ad \neq bd$. Let $q = ac/(a, c)$. We have*

$$\log L_n(f) \sim \frac{n}{\varphi(q)}\sum_{1\le r\le q,\ (r,q)=1}\max\Big(\frac{a}{(br)_a},\frac{c}{(dr)_c}\Big). \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Suppose $p^2 \mid L_n(f)$. It implies that $p^2 \mid (ai + b)(ci + d)$ for some i. If $p \mid ai + b$ and $p \mid ci + d$ then $p \mid (ad - bc)i$. If $p \nmid (ad - bc)$ then $p \mid i$ and consequently $p \mid b$ and

$p \mid d$. Thus, if $p \nmid (ad-bc)bd$ and $p^2 \mid (ai+b)(ci+d)$ then $p^2 \mid (ai+b)$ or $p^2 \mid (ci+d)$. In these cases $p \le M_n = \max(\sqrt{an+b}, \sqrt{cn+d}, |(ad-bd)bd|)$.

Thus we write

$$L_n(f) = \prod_{p \le M_n} p^{\beta_p(n)} \prod_{p > M_n} p^{\epsilon_p(n)} = \prod_{p \le M_n} p^{\beta_p(n)-\epsilon_p(n)} \prod_{p} p^{\epsilon_p(n)}, \tag{4.3}$$

where $\epsilon_p(n) = 1$ if $p \mid f(i)$ for some $i \le n$ and $\epsilon_p(n) = 0$ otherwise. Since $p^{\beta_p(n)} \le f(n)$ we have that $\beta_p(n) \ll \log n/\log p$ and then

$$\sum_{p \le M_n} (\beta_p(n) - \epsilon_p(n)) \log p \ll (\log n)\pi(M_n) \ll \sqrt{n}. \tag{4.4}$$

Thus,

$$\log L_n(f) = \sum_{\substack{p \mid f(i) \\ \text{for some } i \le n}} \log p + O(\sqrt{n}) \tag{4.5}$$

Let $q = ac/(a,c)$. Suppose that $p \equiv r^{-1} \pmod q$, $(r,q) = 1$. Let $k = (br)_a$ the least positive integer such that $k \equiv br \pmod a$. Then $p \mid (ai+b)$ for some $i \le n$ if and only if $kp \le an+b$. Similarly, let $j = (dr)_c$ be the least positive integer such that $j \equiv dr \pmod c$. Again, $p \mid (ci+d)$ for some $\le i \le n$ if $jp \le cn+d$. Thus, the primes $p \equiv r^{-1} \pmod{ac}$ counted in the sum above are those such that $p \le \max(\frac{an+b}{k}, \frac{cn+d}{j})$. The prime number theorem for arithmetic progressions implies that there are $\sim \frac{n}{\varphi(q)} \max(\frac{a}{k}, \frac{c}{j})$ of such primes.

We finish the proof summing up in all $1 \le r \le q$, $(r,q) = 1$. □

5. Some remarks about the error term

It is known that the estimate $E(n) = \log \mathrm{l.c.m.}\{1, \dots, n\} - n = O(n^{1/2+\epsilon})$ is equivalent to the Riemann hypothesis. Probably it is also true that $E_f(n) = O(n^{1/2+\epsilon})$ for any irreducible quadratic sequence, but it is clear that to prove that $E_f(n) = O(n^\theta)$ for some $\theta < 1$ is a very hard problem.

Recently K. Homma [3] has proved that if $D < 0$ then

$$\#\{\nu/p \in I : \ 0 < \nu < p \le x : \ f(\nu) \equiv 0 \pmod p\} = \pi(x)\Big(1 + O(1/(\log x)^\theta)\Big)$$

for any $\theta < 8/9$. Using this result and the known error term for the prime number theorem for arithmetic progressions it is possible to prove that $E_f(n) = O(\frac{n}{\log^\alpha n})$ for some $\alpha > 0$, when $f(x)$ is an irreducible quadratic polynomial of the form $f(x) = ax^2 + c$, $a, c > 0$.

References

[1] P. Bateman, *A limit involving Least Common Multiples*: 10797, American Mathematical Monthly **109** (2002), no. 4, 393-394.

[2] W. Duke, J. Friedlander and H.Iwaniec, *Equidistribution of roots of a quadratic congruence to prime moduli*, Ann. of Math. **141** (1995), no. 2, 423–441.

[3] K. Homma, *On the discrepancy of uniformly distributed roots of quadratic congruences*, Journal of Number Theory **128** (2008)

[4] A. Toth, *Root of quadratic congruences*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices **14** (2000), 719–739.

Instituto de Ciencias Matemáticas (CSIC-UAM-UCM-UC3M) and Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 28049 Madrid, Spain

E-mail address: `franciscojavier.cilleruelo@uam.es`